DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 030 938 CG 004 186

By-Hudson, Wellborn R. III

Evaluation of the Contributions of Video Tape Recordings to T-Group Processes.

South Dakota Univ., Vermillion.
Pub Date 68
Note-18p.
EDRS Price MF-$0.25 HC-$1.00
Descriptors-Audio Video Laboratories, *Counseling Effectiveness, Counselors, *Evaluation, *Evaluation Methods, Microcounseling, *T Groups, *Video Tape Recordings

The 1968 Summer NDEA Guidance Institute at the University of South Dakota studied the impact of video recordings on members of counseling groups to see what their perceptions were when they realized they would later be confronted with their behavior via the tapes. The 32 members of the Institute, practicing counselors in the public schools in the upper-midwest, were divided into four groups so that each group contained the same proportion of elementary and secondary counselors. Each group met four times a week for two hours under experienced group work leaders. Two weekly sessions were video taped, leaving two sessions for group review of the previous day's recording. Each group member filled out an opinionnaire after the review sessions. All groups were deprived of the use of the tape equipment for a period of two weeks and the effects of this deprivation were studied via a second opinionnaire. Generally, the groups took a positive view of their counseling sessions and were not much bothered by the presence of the video equipment. The counseling sessions seemingly increased in effectiveness as the eight weeks passed, with progressively deeper involvement of the group members emerging with time. Statistical data tables and reaction forms are appended. (Author/CJ)

ED030938

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

Evaluation of the Contributions of Video Tape Recordings to T - Group Processes

Wellborn R. Hudson, III, Ph.D.
University of South Dakota

Introduction

In the last few years, there has been increased interest among counselors and counselor education in using video tape recording to facilitate counseling and the training of counselors. Much of the work with this new medium has been done in the past two or three years and very little has been reported in the literature. Much of what has been done has been of an exploratory nature, due, I suspect, to the fact that the necessary equipment has only recently come down in cost to a point such that it was economically feasible.

Much of what has been reported so far was concerned with the utility of video tape in the individual counselling situation (Poling, 1964; Kagan, 1966). Moreover, two basic types of physical arrangement have been utilized. On one hand, there have been a number of reports of projects in which the video recording equipment has been concealed from the counselor and client during the counseling session, even though they knew that the session was being video taped (Kagan, 1966). On the other hand, there have been reports of studies in which the physical arrangement was an open studio with the cameras in full view of the counselor and counselee. (Poling, 1964). Generally, the presence of these devices has not had any great detrimental effect on the counseling session according to the investigators. Poling's (1964) counselors and clients reported that the cameras had a distracting effect during the

004186

early stages of the initial interviews but were quickly forgotten about as the interview moved forward. The gains in quality of critique session were reported to more than offset the small disturbances resulting from the presence of the equipment.

There is one other respect in which studies in this area have differed: In some studies, either the client or the counselor or both were later confronted with their behavior, while in others the video recording was used only for critique purposes with the supervisor. Reports indicate that both kinds of uses have been very promising and productive.

In those situations in which the client was later confronted with his own behavior, little has been reported about the effect the coming confrontation has had in the counseling session in terms of the client's own perceptions. It seems reasonable to suppose that during early counseling sessions, the prospect of being confronted with one's own behavior might have an inhibiting effect. Later, as one becomes used to the process, there should be less inhibition, a feeling of deeper involvement, and perhaps more openness on the part of the counselee. Thus it would seem appropriate to inquire of the counselee what his perceptions were of the effect that the video recording had on him when he realized that he would later be confronted with his behavior.

The 1968 Summer NDEA Guidance Institute at the University of South Dakota offered an opportunity to study the impact of video recordings on members of counseling groups. It is with the results of this

study that the present paper is concerned.

The Setting

The 32 members of the Institute were all practicing counselors in schools in the upper-midwest. Some were elementary counselors and some were secondary counselors. These people were divided into four groups in such a way that each group contained the same proportion of elementary and secondary counselors. Each group met four times per week for two hours, or a total of eight hours per week. The four group leaders were members of the summer session staff of the School of Education, who worked half-time with the institute and taught half-time in the regular summer school program. All group leaders were experienced in group work and all held a doctorate degree.

All groups met in the same place but at different hours of the day. I.e. two groups met in the morning and two met in the afternoon. Ten chairs were arranged in a horse shoe configuration around a coffee table at one end of a class-room. Two video cameras were located at the open end of the horse shoe so that they could cover both halves of the group. The cameras were fixed, and once the video recorders had been started by the group leader, no further adjustments were made. All equipment was in full view of the group members at all times.

The Monday and Thursday sessions were video taped and the Tuesday and Friday sessions were reserved for review of the previous day's recording. In this way, each group member could be confronted with his behavior via the video recordings.

Methods and Procedures

In order to investigate the perceptions of group members of the impact of video taping (and potential confrontation), each member was asked to fill out an opionnaire at the end of each Tuesday and Friday session. However, we were also interested in studying the effect of depriving the counseling groups of the use of the video recordings. To this end, each group was deprived of the use of the equipment for two of the eight weeks. This was scheduled in such a way that no two groups were deprived at the same time and in such a way that deprivation could be studied as a function of the length of time the group had been meeting. I.e., Group I was deprived for the first two weeks, Group II for the second two weeks, etc.

Consequently two opionnaires were used. Form A of the Video Reaction Form (VRF) was used when the group was using the video medium and Form B of the VRF was used when the group was deprived. Form A consisted of 11 items, 7 of which were scalar and asked the respondent to provide a ranking of the perception asked for. The remaining four items asked for factual information about the conduct of the session and the use of the video equipment. Form B contained a total of 13 items, 5 of which were scalar and 8 of which were factual. This report is limited to the results obtained from the scalar items, although copies of the two forms in their entirety are included here.

The mean and standard deviation for each of the scalar items were calculated for:

1) Each session of each week for each form
2) Each group over all sessions for each form
3) Each week over all groups for each form

Results and Discussion

Tables 1 - 4 present the means, standard deviations observed on the scalar items for the two forms of the VRF. Because of space limitations, the analyses by session, by week, by group have not been presented.

In studying these results, I think we learned several things. For one thing, we learned that no matter how much you try to impress people with the importance of responding, there will always be those who are recalcitrant to observation. This resulted in the attenuation of our N's in some parts of the analysis.

For another thing, we were forcefully reminded that no matter how well you plan an experiment, things go wrong. In this case, the necessity for rescheduling some of the institute consultants and some of the field work of the institute members resulted in there being practically no meetings during the last half of the seventh and all of the eighth weeks. This accounts for the lack of data during the seventh week and the small N's during the eighth week.

As you study the tables you will note that the N's associated with the various means change from place to place. This is because the means and standard deviations are based only on respondents. Those who failed to respond to an item were not included in the N for that item.

When the responses to the seven items were analyzed by group, (see Table 1), it was found that there were statistically significant differences between the groups on four of the seven items

(alpha = .05). The highest mean was that of Group I (5.46) while the lowest was that of Group 2 (4.50). Generally, the groups tended to take a fairly positive view of their counseling sessions.

The same observations could be made with respect to the second item, except that the differences were not quite as extreme. Here, the range was from 4.79 to 5.48.

The analysis of the responses to item five suggests that in general the groups felt that the video taping had little effect on the functioning of the group during the counseling sessions. While the overall F was significant at the .05 level, it seems safe to say that the group members weren't much bothered by the presence of the video equipment. Evidently, they felt that they had a fairly good experience and that the possibility of being confronted with their behavior did not impair their functioning.

These observations appear to be verified in the data for item eight. I.e., while the overall F was significant at the 5% level, the overall trend was in the direction of "slight" or "very little" in response to the question, "How threatened were you by the video taping?"

The data for item 10 are interesting in a couple of respects. First, the fact that the overall F was not statistically significant suggests that all members of all groups were consistent in their perception of their level of involvement. Second, the numerical values of these means suggest that the members felt that they were only moderately involved in the group process. This is a bit misleading in this case, however; an examination of individual responses revealed that 140 of 182 respondents (77%) marked this item as five

or higher. Evidently, respondents tended to mark this item as either high or low, with little tendency to choose the middle options.

It was also possible to make similarity comparisons on a week by week basis (see Table 2). In this set of analyses, four statistically significant F - ratios were found: these were for items 1, 2, 5, and 10. We have tentatively interpreted these findings as follows, pending further analysis.

For item one, there appears to be a rising tendency among the means. This suggests that the counseling sessions were seen as increasingly effective as the eight weeks went on.

For item two, the same trend seems to have emerged.

Item five is a bit more difficult to interpret. In this case, the weights for the responses ranged from 1 (for very little) to 7 (for very much). One would expect that if the responses had high means to begin with, that the means would decrease as time went on. Or, if the means were low to begin with, they would remain low. In these data, there seemed to be an upward trend among the means as time passed, thereby seeming to run counter to all expectations. This may be accounted for by the fact that one of the institute consultants (who appeared on the scene at the end of the fourth week) made extensive use of the video recordings in the groups for purposes of immediate recall. This doubtless had a significant impact on the groups from that point on.

Item ten was another case in which there was a gradual upward trend among the means. This is consistent with what might be expected in

terms of progressively deeper involvement of the group members.

Similar analyses were carried out for Form B of the VRF and the results appear in Tables 3 and 4. This was the form used during those sessions where the video recordings were not used. Since the data are missing for Group 4 (in Table 3) and for the last two weeks (in Table 4), the analyses are restricted accordingly.

For item 3, the progressive downward trend among the means was statistically significant at the .05 level. This seems to suggest that the groups became less satisfied with the effectiveness of their sessions when deprived of the video recordings. This finding may imply that the groups became dependent upon the video recordings as time went by, even though they became somewhat threatened by them.

The results for item 4 seem to convey the same kinds of implications, for even though the downward trend was not as pronounced, the overall F was statistically significant at the .05 level.

The small, but statistically significant F for item 8 probably raises more questions than it answers. Since there was no clear trend here the tentative conclusion is that the groups differed in the way they interpreted the item. This is one of those type G errors that Lindquist (1953) speaks of which brings more obscurity than clarity.

In the week by week analysis (Table 4), only two significant F's were found - i.e. those for items three and four. It should be noted that this analysis actually represents a finer breakdown of

the analysis shown in Table 3, since the data for the first two weeks came entirely from Group I those of the second two weeks from Group 2, etc. Consequently, similar interpretations can be made.

Taken all together, there findings suggest that the enrollees found the group counseling experience to be generally quite worthwhile. The use of video tape recordings to facilitate group interaction and understanding seems to have only slight impairing effects during the early stages. The long run gains appeared to more than offset the difficulties encountered early in the experience.

As a result of these findings, we are now in a position to recommend that video taping be considered as an aid in group counseling. It appears to be maximally beneficial when used as soon after the close of the counseling session as possible. As a device for capturing the ongoing process, we have found none better: this is especially true with respect to non-verbal cues. It is here more than anywhere else that this medium makes a unique contribution.

TABLE I
Item Means, Standard Deviation & Number Responding By Item Over Groups for Form A of the VRF

	ITEM NUMBER							
	1	2	3.	5	6	8	10	
GROUP 1	5.46	5.48	5.05	2.25	4.63	1.11	5.81	$\bar{X}$
	1.29	1.27	1.55	1.89	1.64	0.31	1.42	s
	.37	37	36	32	30	27	32	N
GROUP 2	4.50	4.79	4.62	3.03	4.15	1.66	5.15	$\bar{X}$
	1.64	1.72	1.70	2.22	1.35	1.07	1.56	s
	36	38	34	37	34	35	41	N
GROUP 3	4.90	4.82	4.76	1.64	4.61	1.40	5.29	$\bar{X}$
	1.09	1.02	1.67	1.37	1.11	1.04	1.49	s
	51	56	46	56	54	55	56	N
GROUP 4	5.37	5.32	5.44	1.87	4.91	1.75	5.40	$\bar{X}$
	1.25	1.30	1.20	1.13	1.21	1.03	1.57	s
	54	54	50	55	54	55	53	N
F	4.514*	3.006*	2.442	5.849*	2.342	3.062*	1.257	
df	3,174	3,181	3,162	3,176	3,168	3,168	3,178	

TABLE 2
Item Means, Standard Deviations and Number Responding
By Week Over Groups For Form A of the VRF

	ITEM NUMBER							
	1	2	3	5	6	8	10	
WEEK 1	4.19	4.13	4.25	1.81	4.63	1.94	4.13	$\bar{X}$
	0.88	0.86	1.35	0.81	0.86	1.03	1.41	s
	16	16	16	16	16	16	16	N
WEEK 2	4.54	4.63	4.45	2.40	4.42	1.63	5.31	$\bar{X}$
	1.46	1.24	1.81	1.88	1.18	1.07	1.47	s
	35	38	31	40	38	40	39	N
WEEK 3	5.40	5.38	5.33	2.40	4.63	—1.32	5.66	$\bar{X}$
	1.25	1.23	1.37	1.88	1.49	0.87	1.28	s
	45	45	42	40	38	37		
WEEK 4	5.13	5.38	4.87	1.40	4.33	1.14	5.39	$\bar{X}$
	0.86	0.70	1.46	0.61	1.30	0.35	1.21	s
	16	16	15	15	15	14	13	N
WEEK 5	5.46	5.28	5.38	1.57	4.95	1.51	5.57	$\bar{X}$
	1.40	1.60	1.46	1.16	1.36	0.87	1.53	s
	41	43	40	42	40	39	46	N
WEEK 6	5.39	5.63	5.20	2.79	4.71	1.28	5.47	$\bar{X}$
	1.38	1.39	1.42	2.21	1.49	0.56	1.67	s
	18	19	15	19	17	18	19	N
WEEK 7								
WEEK 8	4.57	4.75	4.86	2.25	4.13	2.25	5.50	s
	0.90	0.97	1.46	2.05	0.78	1.92	1.87	$\bar{X}$
	7	8	7	8	8	8	8	N
F	3.642*	3.537*	2.108	2.201*	0.866	2.095	2.274*	
d f	6,171	6,178	6,159	6,173	6,165	6,165	6,175	

.05Fg,150 = 2.16

TABLE 3

Means, Standard Deviations, and Number Responding By Item Over Groups for Form B of the VRF

	ITEM NUMBER					
GROUP	3	4	5	8	9	
1	6.56	6.40	5.00	1.00	0.00	$\bar{X}$
	0.50	0.71	1.63	0.00	0.00	s
	16	15	12	1	0	N
GROUP	5.10	5.00	5.00	3.07	4.18	$\bar{X}$
2	1.04	1.10	0.82	1.44	0.39	s
	10	10	6	14	11	N
GROUP	3.78	4.06	5.20	1.81	4.60	$\bar{X}$
3	2.04	1.91	1.08	1.29	0.80	s
	9	16	10	16	15	
GROUP 4						
F	14.102*	10.302*	.068	3.472*	2.370	
df	2,32	2,38	2,25	2,28	1,24	

*p .05

TABLE 4
Means, Standard Deviations, and Number Responding
By Week Over Groups for Form B of the VRF

	ITEM NUMBER					
WEEK	3	4	5	8	9	
1	6.50	6.50	4.60	1.00	0.00	$\bar{X}$
	0.50	0.50	1.63	0.00	0.00	s
	8	8	5	1	0	N
WEEK 2	6.63	6.29	5.29	0.00	0.00	$\bar{X}$
	0.48	0.88	1.58	0.00	0.00	s
	8	7	7	0	0	N
WEEK 3	5.50	5.50	5.25	3.36	4.22	$\bar{X}$
	0.76	0.96	0.83	1.43	0.42	s
	6	6	4	11	9	N
WEEK 4	4.50	4.25	4.50	2.00	4.00	$\bar{X}$
	1.12	0.83	0.50	0.82	0.00	s
	4	4	2	3	2	N
WEEK 5	2.00	2.38	5.20	2.13	4.57	$\bar{X}$
	0.63	1.11	0.98	1.45	0.73	s
	5	8	5	8	7	N
WEEK 6	6.00	5.75	5.20	1.50	4.63	$\bar{X}$
	0.00	0.66	1.17	1.00	0.86	s
	4	8	5	8	8	N
F	33.971*	22.182*	.230	2.588	.790	
df	5,29	5,35	5,22	4,26	3,22	

VIDEO REACTION FORM
Form A

Group _____ Seat _____ Date _____

1. How would you rate the effectiveness of the counseling session just review?

Excellent : 7 : 6 : 5 : 4 : 3 : 2 : 1 : Very Poor

2. How would you have rated the counseling session just after its completion?

Excellent : 7 : 6 : 5 : 4 : 3 : 2 : 1 : Very Poor

3. How would you rate the effectiveness of the critique session just completed?

Excellent : 7 : 6 : 5 : 4 : 3 : 2 : 1 : Very Poor

4. How much of the video recording was reviewed during the critique session?

a. Less than 1/4
b. Between 1/4 and 1/2
c. Between 1/2 and 3/4
d. More than 3/4 but not all of it.
e. All of it.

5. How much do you think the video taping affected the functioning of the group during the counseling session just reviewed?

Very Little : 1 : 2 : 3 : 4 : 5 : 6 : 7 : Very Much

6. What kind of effect did the video recording have on the group during the counseling session just reviewed?

Strongly Positive : 7 : 6 : 5 : 4 : 3 : 2 : 1 : Strongly Negative

7. What made you think that these effects were due primarily to the video taping?

a. feelings you had about video recordings.
b. feelings expressed by other group members about video recordings.
c. behavior manifested by other members (e.g. squirming, looking at the camera, hiding from the camera, etc.)
d. a. and b.
e. a. and c.
f. a., b., c.
g. other evidence (please explain)

8. How threatened were you by the video taping?

Very Little : 1 : 2 : 3 : 4 : 5 : 6 : 7 : Very Much

Form A

9. At what points during the counseling session did you feel <u>most</u> threatened by the video taping?

   a. near the beginning
   b. near the end
   c. about the middle
   d. a. and b.
   e. a. and c.
   f. b. and c.

10. How deeply do you think you were involved in what the group was doing during the counseling session?

Very Deeply : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : Very Superficially
7 6 5 4 3 2 1

11. At what points during the counseling did you feel most deeply involved?

   a. near the beginning
   b. near the end
   c. about the middle
   d. a. and b.
   e. a. and c.
   f. b. and c.

VIDEO REACTION FORM

Form B

Group_____ Seat_____ Date_____

1. Did your group untilize audio tape during this session?

   Yes No

2. If the answer to item 1 was yes, what additional information would have been available from a video recording?

3. How would you rate the effectiveness of the counseling session just reviewed?

   Excellent : 7 : 6 : 5 : 4 : 3 : 2 : 1 ; Very Poor

4. How would you have rated the counseling session just after its completion?

   Excellent : 7 : 6 : 5 : 4 : 3 : 2 : 1 : Very Poor

5. How would you rate the effectiveness of the critique session just completed?

   Excellent : 7 : 6 : 5 : 4 : 3 : 2 : 1 :

6. If your group used an audio recording during the critique session, how much of the tape was reviewed?

   a. Less than 1/4
   b. Between 1/4 and 1/2
   c. Between 1/2 and 3/4
   d. More than 3/4 but not all of it
   e. All of it.

7. Do you think that the discontinuation of video tape has had some effect on this critique session? (Please elucidate)

8. In retrospect, how much do you think the video taping affected the functioning of the group during the counseling sessions in which it was used?

   Very Little : 1 : 2 : 3 : 4 : 5 : 6 : 7 : Very Much

9. What kind of effect did the video recording of the counseling sessions have on the group?

   Strongly positive: 7 : 6 : 5 : 4 : 3 : 2 : 1 : Strongly Negative

Form B

10. If the effects varied from time to time, at what points did you think they were most noticeable?

a. In the early sessions
b. In the more recent sessions
c. In the middle sessions.
d. In a. and b.
e. In a. and c.
f. In b. and c.

11. How would you compare the productiveity of the sessions utilizing video tape with the sessions utilizing only audio tape? The sessions in which the VTR was used were

a. much more productive.
b. somewhat more productive.
c. about equally productive.
d. somewhat less productive.
e. much less productive.

12. What made you think that these effects were due primarily to the video taping?

a. feelings you had about video recordings.
b. feelings expressed by other group members about video recordings.
c. behavior manifested by other group members (e.g. squirming, looking at the camers, hiding from the camers, etc.)
d. a. and b.
e. a. and c.
f. b. and c.
g. a., b., and c.
h. other evidence (please explain)

13. Do you think that in comparison to audio recordings, the video recordings have unique advantages and/or disadvantages? If so, what do you think they are?

REFERENCES

Kagan, N. Progress Report, NDEA, Title VII, Grant Number OE 7-32-0410-270 (April 1, 1966 through July 31, 1966). Washington: U.S. Office of Education, 1966.

Lindquist, E. F. Design and Analysis of Experiments in Psychology and Education. Boston: Houghton-Mifflin, 1953.

Poling, E. G. Video Tape Recordings in Counseling Practicum. NDEA, Title VII, Grant Number 7-51-0140-246. Washington:U.S. Office of Education, 1964.